

**Appl. No.** : 10/741,308  
**Filed** : December 19, 2003

### **AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

Please amend the drawings as follows:

In the Office Action, the Examiner stated that the drawing informalities noted in the Office Action mailed on June 23, 2005 must be corrected in the manner set forth in that Office Action. **Replacement Sheets** for Figures 1-11 are attached at the end of this paper. These changes provide formal drawings conforming to the rules for drawings and do not add any new matter.

~~Appl. No.~~ : 10/741,308  
~~Filed~~ : December 19, 2003

### REMARKS

By way of summary, Claims 1-67 were originally filed with the application. By this Amendment, Claims 1, 20, 36, 46, 56, and 65 are amended and no new claims are added. Accordingly, Claims 1-67 remain pending in the application.

Additionally the Applicant respectfully draws the Examiner's attention to the published version of the application, U.S. 2005/0076161, published on April 7, 2005. In the published application, Figures 6c and 6d have been omitted from the Applicant's filed application.

#### Objection to the Specification

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the following informality: in Paragraph [0035], the Applicant changed "a material" to "an material" citing a grammatical error. The Applicant thanks the Examiner for their observation that proper grammar is "a material". By this paper, the Applicant has amended paragraph [0035] to remedy this error.

#### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C §102

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 5-10, 15-17, 36-38, 43-48, 51, 53-58, 60, 61, and 63-67 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,767,282 to Matsuyama, et al. ("Matsuyama"). The Applicant believes that independent Claims 1, 36, 46, 56, and 65 as amended in this paper distinguish the Matsuyama reference and hereby requests reconsideration of the above-captioned application in light of the remarks contained herein.

The Applicant discloses systems and methods for use with a computer application configured to respond to a first input device data having a first format where second input device data having a second format is converted to a simulated first input device data having the first format and substituted for the first input device data. As discussed in Paragraph [0033] of the Applicant's specification, the system is designed to allow the user to choose a second input device, in a non-limiting embodiment, a golf club, as a device input to a computer application instead of a first input device, in a non-limiting embodiment, a mouse controller, to control the movement of an object in the computer application. Hence, the Applicant's invention allows the second device to be substituted for the first device for control of an object in the computer application.

**Appl. No.** : 10/741,308  
**Filed** : December 19, 2003

After reviewing the Matsuyama reference and, in particular, after carefully reviewing Column 10, lines 1-50, the Applicant notes that Matsuyama fails to disclose any such substitution. Specifically, the grip-type real interface device 51 disclosed by Matsuyama, the second device, is an input means that a player swings to hit a golf ball within a game space. A controller 52 comprising buttons, the first device, is an input means the player manipulates for selection of the number of players, the level of golf courses, the kinds of golf clubs to be used, and other selection functions. Thus, the first and second input devices disclosed by Matsuyama perform functions of selection and actuation which are both necessary to operate the game system.

Consequently, Matsuyama discloses a device possessing first and second input devices which provide first and second input device data which cannot be substituted for one another. That is to say, a player needs to make a selection with the first input device and then needs to actuate the second input device to hit a golf ball within the game space for operation of the game. This is in contrast to the Applicant's invention which discloses a second input device which provides a second input device data that is converted to a simulated first input device data that is substituted for a first input device data provided by a first input device. Thus, Matsuyama does not disclose, suggest, or motivate substituting the first input device data for the second input device data. For these reasons, the Applicant believes that amended independent Claims 1, 36, and 46 are allowable over Matsuyama.

Moreover, with respect to independent Claims 56 and 65, the Applicant believes that independent Claim 56 and 65 as amended are also allowable over Matsuyama for reasons similar to those discussed above in reference to Claims 1, 36, and 46. With regards to Claim 56, there is no teaching in Matsuyama of a method for replicating first input device data of a first input device having a first format to a computer application to control movement of a graphical representation of an object where an electronic signal representative of the movement of the object having a second format different from the first format is translated into replicated first input device data having the first format and where the replicated first input device data is substituted for the first input device data. Likewise, with respect to Claim 65, there is no teaching in Matsuyama of a computer readable medium comprising code for configuring a processor to translate a signal representing physical movement of an object, where the signal has

**Appl. No.** : 10/741,308  
**Filed** : December 19, 2003

a signal format incompatible with the computer application, into a simulated device data compatible with computer application and substituted in place of a input device data having a signal format compatible with the computer application. Again, the Applicant does not believe that Matsuyama recites substitution of simulated input device data for input device data.

#### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Examiner further rejected independent Claim 20 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuyama in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,162,123 to Woolston ("Woolston"). The Applicant believes that Claim 20 as amended is also allowable over Matsuyama for reasons similar to those discussed above in reference to Claims 1, 36, 46, 56, and 65. In Column 8, Lines 65 through Column 9, Line 47, Woolston discloses a game controller 240 which utilizes a sword apparatus 200 and receivers 210, 220, and 230 to triangulate the position of the sword apparatus 200 for projection into a virtual reality. Woolston does not, however, disclose or suggest a system for measuring movement of an object in one or more directions which creates a signal representative of the movement of the object in a first format, converts the signal into a simulated input device data having a second format that a computer application is configured to receive, and substitutes the simulated input device data in place of an input device data having the second format. Furthermore, as discussed above, Matsuyama fails to disclose or suggest the same. Thus, the Applicant believes that Matsuyama, either alone, or in combination with Woolston, would fail to motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute simulated input device data having the second format in place of input device data having the second format.

#### Summary

For the foregoing reasons, the Applicant believes that independent Claims 1, 20, 36, 46, 56, and 65 are allowable over the art of record. The Applicant further notes that dependent Claims 2-19, 21-35, 47-55, 57-64, and 66-67 define additional patentable subject matter and are also allowable due to their respective dependencies on independent Claims 1, 20, 36, 46, 56, and 65. Consequently, the Applicant believes that the above-captioned application is in condition for allowance and requests the prompt allowance of the same. Should there be any impediment to

**Appl. No.** : 10/741,308  
**Filed** : December 19, 2003

the prompt allowance of this application that could be resolved by a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at the number shown below.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: August 21, 2006

By: 

Michael H. Trenholm  
Registration No. 37,743  
Attorney of Record  
Customer No. 20,995  
(951) 781-9231

2760196\_2  
071706